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Abstract
The purpose of this study is to measure the impact of the personal selling on building overall brand equity in the Egyptian banking sector through 5 customer-based brand equity (CBBE) dimensions (brand awareness, brand associations, brand perceived quality, brand loyalty and brand trust).

This study used quantitative approach, which consists of self-administrated questionnaires distributed on a quota sample. Data were collected from 465 bank customers and analysed by using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). The findings of this study showed that personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on building bank brand equity via the 5 CBBE dimensions. Given the fact that all the CBBE dimensions are important on building bank brand equity, it has been found that only brand loyalty and brand perceived quality have a significant positive direct effect on building bank brand equity.

This study has unique value to the service branding particularly in the Egyptian banking sector. This study closes the gap in the area of service brand equity by combining the most important marketing communication tool in the banking sector “the personal selling”, 5 CBBE dimensions and overall brand equity in a single study. It also provides directions to the service provider and particularly the bank managers on providing brand-building activities, and evaluating the marketing strategies and programmes effectively.

1. Introduction
In our competitive business environment, the size of the service sector is increasing all over the world, in both developed and emerging countries (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2010). This sector constitutes 40% of gross domestic product (GDP) in some emerging countries to more than 70% in some developed countries (Ghoneim, 2007). In Egypt, the service sector is the largest and fastest-growing economic sector and accounts for almost 51% of GDP (Encyclopedia of the Nations, 2012). The banking sector constitutes one of the core sources of service sector revenue in Egypt (Encyclopedia of the Nations, 2012). Therefore, it represents a cornerstone of Egypt’s financial architecture and plays a vital role in overall economic development and growth (American Chamber of Commerce Egypt, 2008).

Over the recent years, the Egyptian banking sector has perceived vital changes, such as: privatization, bank mergers and acquisitions. Therefore, these changes provide a golden opportunity for the entry of more foreign banks that have perceived Egypt as a lucrative market (American Chamber of Commerce Egypt, 2008). The appearance of new leading partners (for example from bank mergers) and the globalization of international markets are both the result of technological developments and the loosening of administrative and monetary interventions that have led to the severe market competition and the risk of declining market shares for each banking institution (Kokkomelis, 1995). This competitive and global banking era has
encouraged institutions to focus on branding strategies (Lambkin and Muzellec, 2008). Branding allows institutions to compete on features other than price alone (Aaker, 1991). Branding is crucial when taking the service marketing into consideration due to the unique features of services like perishability, inseparability, intangibility and heterogeneity (Kapferer, 2004). Especially in financial services where there is little opportunity to differentiate between banking offers (Knisely, 1979; Berry et al., 1988; Dobree and Page, 1990; Balmer, 1995; Peklo, 1995; Berry, 2000). Thus, bank brand is considered to be a strategic tool that banks can practice to attract new customers, develop strong relationships and achieve competitive advantage (De Chernatony and McDonald, 2003; Devlin, 2004; O’Loughlin and Szmidt, 2005; De Chernatony and Cottam, 2006). Hence, building, using and maintaining brands is of high importance in order to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage in the market place and to stand high in the crowd (Kim et al., 2003).

Subsequently, the emergence of brand equity has risen in importance for both academics and practitioners (Keller, 2003). Brand equity has been defined in different ways and for different purposes, yet till now no common agreement has emerged (Vazquez et al., 2002; Keller, 2003; Davcick et al., 2015). For example, from the financial perspective, brand equity has been defined as the incremental cash flows, which accrue to branded products over unbranded products (Simon and Sullivan, 1993); as the total value of a brand, which is a separable asset when sold or included in a balance sheet (Feldwick, 1996). Additionally, from the marketing perspective, brand equity has been defined as “customer-based brand equity” (CBBE). This perspective has many definitions relying on different dimensions. In this study, the brand equity is perceived based on the marketing perspective but as a separate construct. It is defined as the value added to a product (goods or services) virtue by its brand name (Farquhar et al., 1991). Setting a separate brand equity construct (separate from its dimensions) will help to recognize the contribution and the importance of each CBBE dimension in the overall brand equity assessment (Yoo et al., 2000). Understanding the dimensions of CBBE, then investing to grow these dimensions will lead to high brand equity (Yoo et al., 2000; Yacout and Elsahn, 2011). Over the years, a range of CBBE dimensions that can be linked to a brand have been identified. However, the common dimensions in all models are the use of one or more dimensions of the Aaker model (1991). The present study examines the effect of these common dimensions, which include (brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations and brand loyalty) in addition to the brand trust on overall brand equity. Brand trust has been conceptualized as a dimension of CBBE due to the high-perceived risk associated in the service sector. Brand trust is a part of customers’ relationship with the brand (Blackston, 1992; Lassar et al., 1995; Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Rios and Riquelme, 2008; Atilgan et al., 2009; Burmann et al., 2009; Rauyruen et al., 2009). Additionally, the impact of the personal selling as one of the major bank marketing communication tools as mentioned by Sadek et al. (2015) is examined on building the overall brand equity via the 5 CBBE dimensions.

The following sections will provide literature review leading to the development of hypotheses; research methods, population and sampling, results and analysis and finally limitations and future research.

2. Literature review
2.1 Customer-based brand equity (CBBE) dimensions

In this study, the CBBE dimensions include brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust. According to the previous studies of Zeithaml (1988); Aaker (1991); Oliver (1997); Yoo et al. (2000); Pappu et al. (2006); and Tong and Hawley (2009); Kumar et al. (2013) the CBBE dimensions have been found to have an impact on
building brand equity. In more details, brand awareness is one of the important facets when focusing on brand equity (Atilgan et al., 2005). Being aware of a brand refers to customers’ ability to recognize or recall the brand (Hoyer and Brown, 1990; Franzen and Bouwman, 2001). Thus, a product or a service with strong brand remembrance influences customer choice towards a specific notion (Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010). Therefore, brand equity increases when the customer has a high level of brand awareness and familiarity with the brand (Atilgan et al., 2005). For the brand perceived quality, Zeithaml (1988) identifies that the perceived quality is considered as a component of brand value. Perceived quality is based on the customer’s personal judgment about a product or services’ overall performance (Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Thus, high perceived quality refers to the superiority of the brand from customer’ point of view through the long-term experience related to the brand. Thus, perceived quality creates value to customers by supporting them with a reason to buy and by differentiating the brand from other competing brands (Kayaman and Arasli, 2007). The third facet that creates brand equity is brand association. Brand association refers to all the traits associated to a brand that is stored in the consumer’s mind (Aaker, 1991). It is composed of multiple ideas, episodes, instances and facts that build a strong network of brand knowledge (Keller, 1993).

Aaker (1991) mentioned that brand association is formed through many experiences and exposures to the product or service (reflecting the product features and aspects). It creates value to the firm and to the customers (Atilgan et al., 2005). Brand association helps to process and retrieve information, distinguishing the brand, generating a reason to buy, creating positive attitudes and presenting a basis for extensions (Aaker, 1991). Rio et al. (2001) suggests that brand associations represent a key element in brand equity creation and management. Hence, brand equity reveals that customers have positive associations to the brand. The fourth facet that creates brand equity is brand loyalty. Brand loyalty leads to brand equity. The attachment that a customer has to a brand allows them to feel a sense of devotion to the company (Yoo et al., 2000). Brand loyalty is the commitment to rebuy or support a product or service consistently in the future. Loyal customers show positive responses to a brand than non-loyal customers do (Grover and Srinivasan, 1992). Brand loyalty is a main dimension of brand equity (Aaker, 1991). It is a key variable for management interested in the value of brand equity when measured from customers’ point of view (Keller, 2001). As for the fifth facet, which is the brand trust, it is viewed as one component of customers’ relationships with brands (Blackston, 1992). Brand trust is measured by the brand ability to deliver its promises. This variable can improve or destroy a relationship between brand and customers, therefore impacting brand equity (Keller, 2003). Based on Garbarino and Johnson (1999) brand trust evolves from past experience and previous interaction. Therefore, the management of trust is a key to build a relationship with customers particularly because customers buy a service before experiencing it (Kinard and Capella, 2006). Based on the above points, the following hypothesis is developed:

H1: CBBE dimensions have a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity.
This hypothesis has been split into five sub-hypotheses as follows:
H1a: Brand awareness has a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity
H1b: Brand perceived quality has a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity
H1c: Brand associations have a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity
H1d: Brand loyalty has a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity
H1e: Brand trust has a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity

2.2 Marketing communication tools
Marketing communication tools play a vital role in the development of brands. They are the means by which products become brands (Kotler and Keller, 2012). These tools help customers to understand what a brand stands for and what its value (Fill, 2002). De Chernatony and Dall’Olmo Riley (1999) argue that marketing communication tools can play several roles in brand development. For example, during brand extensions the role of marketing communication tools is to show buyers how the benefits from the existing brand have been transferred or extended to the new brand. Other roles might be to remind buyers and reinforce their perceptions in order to protect market share. The following part will focus on the impact of personal selling on building bank brand equity based on the study conducted by Sadek et al. (2015), in which it has been found that the personal selling represents the most important marketing communication tools that help build bank brand equity. Based on Sadek et al. (2015), the personal selling has been defined as all the staff with the desired attitudes, knowledge and relational skills to ensure that the customers will receive the service for which they are paying as mentioned by Dmour et al. (2013). In more details, it has been found that personal selling is an influential factor in shaping customers’ perceptions towards brands (Berry and Lampo, 2004). Particularly, in financial services where bank customers prefer face-to-face interactions especially when perceived risk is high (Page and Luding, 2003).

Firstly, it has been found that personal selling affect positively the brand awareness by informing or reminding people of the brand (Fill, 2002). Secondly, Personal selling contributes to the development of customers’ perceptions of service quality through their attitude, behaviour and knowledge (Bowen and Schneider, 1985; Zeithaml et al., 1993; Bitner et al., 1994; Wall and Berry, 2007). Thirdly, personal selling attitude, behaviour and knowledge play a crucial role in the service brand image development (Schneider and Bowen, 1993; Gronroos, 1994; Ind, 1997; De Chernatony and Dall’Olmo Riely, 1999; De Chernatony and Harris, 2000; De Chernatony et al., 2003; Rajh and Dosen, 2009; Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010). Thus, personal selling became a very important tool in shaping opinions and in determining brand associations (Berry, 2000). Fourthly, customers’ evaluation of personal selling efforts and service performance has been found to have a strong effect on customers’ satisfaction and loyalty (Keaveney, 1995; Mohr and Bitner, 1995; Evans et al., 2002). Fifthly, personal selling plays an essential role in delivering the promise through the service provider’s performance (Wall and Berry, 2007). Therefore, personal selling should play their appropriate roles in delivering what the brand stands for, its abilities and promises to reach customer trust towards the brand (Schneider and Bowen, 1993; De Chernatony and Dall’Olmo Riely, 1999; De Chernatony and Harris, 2000; Evans et al., 2002; De Chernatony et al., 2003; Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010).

Based on the above points, the following hypothesis was developed:

H2: Personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on CBBE dimensions.
H2a: personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand awareness
H2b: Personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand perceived quality
H2c: personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand associations
H2d: personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand loyalty
H2e: personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand trust

Figure (1): Proposed model
3. Research Methods

A quantitative approach was conducted to test the research hypotheses. A list of multiple-item scales for each variable was adopted from the literature. A ten-item scale for personal selling was adapted from Lee and Back, (2007), Rajh and Dosen, (2009). Regarding the CBBE dimensions (brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust). A six-item scale for brand awareness was adapted from Srull, (1984), Alba and Hutchinson, (1987), Rossiter and Percy, (1987), Yoo et al. (2000), Yoo and Donthu, (2001), Netemeyer et al. (2004). A nine-item scale for brand perceived quality was adapted from Yoo et al. (2000), Netemeyer et al. (2004), Pappu et al. (2005, 2006), Dagger et al. (2007). A ten-item scale for brand associations was adapted from Aaker and Blanco, (1995), Lassar et al. (1995), Yoo et al. (2000), Netemeyer et al. (2004), Pappu et al. (2005,2006), Tong and Hawley, (2009). A nine-item scale for brand loyalty was adapted from Beatty and Kahle, (1988), Yoo et al. (2000), Yoo and Donthu, (2001), Lewis and Soureli, (2006), Sichtmann, (2007), Pinar et al. (2012). A thirteen-item scale for brand trust was adapted from Dimitriadis and Kyrezis, (2008). The items for the overall brand equity (four items) were derived from Yoo et al. (2000), Yoo and Donthu, (2001). While the items for each variable were drawn from the above-mentioned research, they were modified to fit the objectives of this study.

4. Population and Sampling

A quota sampling technique was used, which is a type of non-probability sampling. This method is the best technique in the non-probability sampling, and is generally used when there is no sampling frame (Saunders et al., 2012). This study was not able to gain hold of a sampling frame (list of bank customers). Given the fact that banks did not agree to provide the researcher with this information because such information was confidential. In this study, the quota sampling contains two main steps. The first step was to select the banks to be surveyed. According to the Central Bank of Egypt (2012), there are a total of eight major banks that cover 70% of the total Egyptian banking sector in terms of customers’ deposits. These banks are from public and private sectors. The public sector contained three banks: National Bank of Egypt (NBE); Banque du Caire and Bank Misr. The private sector included five banks, Commercial International Bank (CIB); Qatar National Bank (QNB); Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC); Arab African International Bank (AAIB) and Barclays. Once the selection of banks was established, the researcher conducted the second step, which was to choose the respondents proportionately to the actual market share in terms of customer deposits found in the focused banks. Although a quota sample is not considered a probability sample, the researcher was careful to reduce bias in order to increase the representativeness of the sample.
The following table illustrates the amount of total customer deposits in each of the focused banks and also presents these banks in ratios to the customer deposits out of 70%. These ratios were then computed to be equivalent to 100% in order to begin the selection of customers from each bank.

Table (1): Banks’ market share in terms of customers’ deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>Total Deposits (Billion)</th>
<th>Market Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBE</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Misr</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banque du Caire</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIB</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QNB</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAIB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>726</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Bank of Egypt and the financial statements of the individual banks 2012

The researcher needed to determine an accurate sample size in order to make valid conclusions. According to Creswell (2009), a sample size of 384 or above is adequate for a population of 100,000 or more. Conversely, Roscoe (1975) stated that a sample size above 500 would lead to incorrect analysis and data error. Thus, the researcher chose a sample size found in the range between these two numbers. The researcher chose to assemble 465 respondents from the selected banks. In order for the research sample to be generalized, the researcher sought to identify the actual percentage of the banks’ market share in terms of customer deposits and selected the numerous respondents equivalent and balanced to the market share percentage.

The following table illustrates the selected banks, their market share and the number of respondents and its percentage in each bank. The researcher visited these banks and began to approach the customers. Respondents were approached and asked if they would like to participate in a research project. Those who agreed were given a questionnaire to fill out.

Table (2): The sample composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Banks</th>
<th>Market share</th>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th>Sample percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBE</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Misr</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank du Caire</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIB</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QNB</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAIB</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>465</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results and analysis

Before testing the hypotheses, several analyses were conducted such as: convergent validity, discriminant validity, reliability of research variables and model fit indices.

5.1 Convergent validity
Confirmatory factor analysis was used to assess the convergent validity of different variables. The rotation method used was Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Factor analysis using the principal component method was used to examine the convergent validity of the personal selling, CBBE dimensions (brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust) and the overall brand equity (as a separate construct). For researchers using factor analysis, consider loadings of 0.30 or more significant for sample sizes of 350 or greater will be appropriate. This guideline should be used as a starting point in factor loadings interpretation (Hair et al., 2010). In this study, the factor loading for each item of the research variables values were above the recommended level (Hair et al., 2010) demonstrating the significant contribution of the items in measuring their variable.

5.2 Reliability of research variables
Testing the reliability of the research variables is very crucial as it shows the extent to which a scale produces consistent result if measurements are made repeatedly.

The following table (3) summarizes the results of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal selling</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand perceived quality</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand associations</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand trust</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand equity</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, Cronbach’s alphas values ranged between 0.795 and 0.974, which indicate an acceptable level of scale reliability for theory testing research (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). This means that each scale will produce consistent result if measurements are made repeatedly.

5.3 Model Fit Indices
Goodness-of-fit-statistics indicating the overall acceptability of structural model analysed. GFI is based on a ratio of the sum of the squared differences between the observed and reproduced matrices, while Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) adjusts for the number of degrees of freedom of a model relative to the number of variables and the number of observations (Hair et al., 2010). Moreover, they indicated that the acceptable fit standards for GFI and AGFI should be greater than 0.9, with values close to 1.00 indicating good fit. Another index, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), which is recommended to be 0.05 or less that indicate a close fit of the model. The following table (4) presents the GFI, AGFI and the RMSEA for the proposed model and the modified model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The measure</th>
<th>The best result according to Hair et al., (1998)</th>
<th>The results of the model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modified Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>Range from 0 to 1 (closer to 1 is better)</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>Range from 0 to 1 (closer to 1 is better)</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, it has been showed that the GFI, AGFI and RMSEA for the proposed model were 0.408, 0.373 and 0.116 respectively. It has been found that in order to enhance the GFI, the AGFI and the RMSEA, covariance should be taken into consideration among the five CBBE dimensions (brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust). After taking the covariance into consideration, the GFI, AGFI and RMSEA become 0.998, 0.970 and 0.030 accordingly, which indicates the good fit of the modified model. After modifying the model, the hypotheses have been tested.

5.4 Testing hypotheses

The AMOS output for the model parameter estimates is presented in table (5). In order to determine if the effect is statistically significant, the unstandardized estimate is divided by its standard error (SE) and yields the critical ratio (CR), which can be interpreted as a t-value. A t-value of 1.96 translates to a 0.5 significance level P-value. Therefore, any number of a critical ratio above 1.96 or P-value less than or equal 0.5 is considered to be significant in the model (Hair et al., 2010).

Table (5): the Unstandardized Estimate, Standardized Estimate, SE, CR, P-value and the result of the direct effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &lt;-- PS</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>6.146</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q &lt;-- PS</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>8.714</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS &lt;-- PS</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>4.591</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &lt;-- PS</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>8.483</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &lt;-- PS</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>8.410</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &lt;-- A</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &lt;-- Q</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &lt;-- ASS</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &lt;-- L</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>6.033</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &lt;-- T</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** is significant at 0.01  S: Supported hypotheses and N.S: Not supported hypotheses

The obtained statistics indicate that all path coefficients results appeared to be significant except the following paths: the path coefficient from brand awareness to overall brand equity, brand associations to overall brand equity and brand trust to overall brand equity. All these paths were found insignificant as the CR are 0.779, 0.589 and 1.318, respectively. These figures are less than 1.96 and the P-values are 0.436, 0.556 and 0.187, respectively. Their P-values are greater than 0.5, which indicates the insignificant paths.

The first hypothesis, which generally stated that: “CBBE dimensions have a significant positive direct effect on the overall brand equity”, was partially supported. It was found that only brand perceived quality and brand loyalty have a significant positive direct effect on the overall brand equity. Brand awareness, association, and trust do not impact directly the overall brand equity. However, there are interrelationships that exist among the five CBBE dimensions. Therefore, they are all important. The brand loyalty has been found to have the strongest effect on the overall brand equity. Since loyalty is “the overall attachment that a customer has to a brand”, customers must develop loyalty, and devotion with the institutions they deal with because their finances and money matters are crucial to them. For this reason, banks must focus...
more on building brand loyalty. It should be developed through the personal selling. Furthermore, brand quality affects the overall brand equity because it takes into consideration the whole performance and excellence of the bank. Since brand loyalty and brand perceived quality have a significant positive direct effect on overall brand equity, it is better to focus on personal selling to reflect good quality and build customer’s loyalty towards the bank.

The second hypothesis, which generally stated that: “Personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on CBBE dimensions”, was supported. It has been found that personal selling has a significant positive direct effect on brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust. This result indicated the importance of the personal selling in creating awareness; in reflecting good quality and constructive features; in building long-term and trustworthy relationships with the customer through the face-to-face communication; and through the interactions that help create a communication channel rich with information.

To conclude, it has been shown that personal selling has a significant positive direct impact on all the 5 CBBE dimensions (brand awareness, brand perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty and brand trust). Given the fact that all CBBE dimensions are interrelated, not all of them impact directly the overall brand equity. There are only two of CBBE dimensions that affect directly the overall brand equity. These two dimensions consist of brand perceived quality and brand loyalty, which were found to have a significant positive direct effect on the overall brand equity in the Egyptian market. Thus, any bank committed to build brand equity must focus on the personal selling and direct it to influence directly on the bank quality and the bank loyalty because high brand equity is the main competitive advantage particularly to a bank.

Figure (2): The final model

6. Limitations and future research
Since this study was conducted in the Egyptian banking sector, the replication can be done within other services (e.g., insurance company, hospitals, airlines, hotels and universities) because the factors that contribute in building the overall brand equity may vary from one service to another. Second, cross-cultural research may reveal different processes of brand equity formation in different cultures. Third, this research focuses on the most important marketing communication tools used in the Egyptian banking sector. Future research might include some other marketing communication tools, in order to study their effect on the creation of service brand equity. A systematic sequence of research involving different marketing communication tools could provide valuable understanding into the effects of various communication tools on creating brand equity. Such insights would enable service brand managers to take better decisions about choosing the right mix of these tools. Fourth, the researcher focuses on customers’ perception they were residence in Alexandria and Cairo the two biggest and diversity cities in Egypt. These customers were approached from inside the banks. For this reason, future research can combine between the managerial perspective (for example, from bank mangers) and the customer perspective. Hence, by examining both perspectives and compare between them, banks will be able to fill the gap (if it exists). Finally, this research mentioned that there are interrelationships between the CBBE dimensions but didn’t shed light on the hierarchical development of these dimensions. Future research can also exploit this piece of information in building a strong brand.
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